



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,502	02/27/2002	David G. McCarthy	402-038-26	2742

7590 05/12/2003  
Mark P. Stone  
Suite 205  
1100 High Ridge Road  
Stamford, CT 06905

EXAMINER

ABRAMS, NEIL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2839

DATE MAILED: 05/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/085502

Applicant(s)

Examiner

N. Abrams

Group Art Unit

2839

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address —

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ This action is FINAL.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- ☐ Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement

## Application Papers

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the:
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

## Attachment(s)

- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2839

Applicant on pages 2, 3 refers to prior art systems with "four circuits" and cites Wise which seems to clearly show use of "four separate circuits". Applicant also states that the prior art systems are not capable of providing "four different circuits". Clarification of these matters is required with appropriate corrections to the spec.

M Claims 1-4, <sup>7</sup>~~8~~, 10, 12 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wise.

Wise discloses a system with a housing, <sup>ten</sup> conductors extending through the housing and with four modules <sup>44, 44', 45, 45'</sup> to be applied to four different circuits, (see fig 4D).  
um

Claims 5, 6, 8, 9-11, 13, 14 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wise. <sup>16, 17, 20</sup>

These claims are to specific arrangements of conductors which have not been shown to produce any stated unexpected advantage and are considered obvious variations.

um Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. <sup>103 as obvious over Electric-Pak</sup> ~~35 U.S.C. 103(a)~~ 8 publication (EP) ~~as obvious~~ taken in view of Wise <sup>and admitted prior art</sup> ~~and admitted prior art~~ <sup>103(a) as obvious</sup>

EP shows a housing through which eight conductors are run and which has ports for six modules.

The reference appears to disclose use of the modules with four different circuits. Since this teaching is not entirely clear it further is submitted that such use of four separate circuits would have been the obvious intended manner of use. Such use of four separate circuits in the


Art Unit: 2839

and admitted prior art, page 2, lines 20-23  
assembly further obvious in view of Wise, see fig 4D. This would enable increased number of  
appliances to be used. Since the EP assembly and module are only shown in a schematic  
manner, it is also submitted that it would have been obvious to form the assembly with busbars,  
housing parts, ports and <sup>plug-in</sup> modules as shown by Wise, this being standard structural arrangements.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to N. Abrams at telephone  
number (703) 308-1729.

N ABRAMS/pj

05/08/03

  
NEIL ABRAMS  
EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 322